

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.  
13 SON V. TRAN, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. CR15-0120-JCC

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL AND  
OTHER DEADLINES

This matter comes before the Court on the stipulated motion of the government and seventeen out of the twenty Defendants arraigned to date (as noted in the motion) to continue the trial in this matter, and to set a new pretrial motion cutoff consistent with that new trial date. (Dkt. No. 262.) Having considered the motion, any responses and objections, and all the files and records herein, the Court finds and rules as follows:

Counsel for all defendants agree that a continuance is necessary. Counsel for the seventeen defendants who have stipulated to the instant motion request a continuance to late January or February of 2016. Two defendants (Long V. Troung, represented by David Hammerstad, and Steven Connell, represented by Allen Bentley) request a shorter continuance. (See Dkt. No. 262 at 3.) Mr. Connell requests a trial date no later than October 31, 2015. (Dkt. No. 263.) A third defendant, Phuong A. Nguyen, represented by Robert Goldsmith, has refused to sign a speedy trial waiver, though Mr. Goldsmith has indicated that he believes a continuance is likely necessary and he does not oppose the instant motion. (See Dkt. No. 262 at 3.)

1       The facts supporting continuing the trial and excluding the consequent delay are set forth  
2 in the Stipulated Motion to Continue, incorporated by this reference, and include the following:  
3 (a) the number of defendants charged; (b) the nature of the prosecution, which includes wiretaps  
4 over four separate phone lines, with many calls in a foreign language; and (c) the volume of  
discovery produced, and still to be produced.

5       THIS COURT FINDS, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)  
6 and (iv), that failure to grant a continuance in this case would be a miscarriage of justice, and  
7 would deny counsel for the parties the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, due to  
8 defense counsels' need for more time to review the considerable volume of discovery and  
evidence produced and still to be produced and to consider possible defenses and motions, taking  
9 into account the exercise of due diligence.

10       THIS COURT FINDS, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(6) and  
11 (7), that a continuance until November 2, 2015 is a reasonable period of delay in that a  
12 substantial majority of the defendants have indicated they require more time to prepare for trial.  
13 The Court finds that more time is, in fact, necessary, given the complexity of the case, the  
number of defendants, and the volume of discovery produced and still to be produced.

14       THIS COURT FINDS, therefore, that pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Sections  
15 3161(h)(6) and 3161(h)(7), the ends of justice will best be served by a continuance, and that they  
16 outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial. While seventeen of  
17 the defendants have stipulated to a longer continuance, they have not yet provided any filings  
18 demonstrating that the shorter continuance requested by Mr. Connell would not give them  
adequate time to prepare. These defendants may request a further continuance should the need  
arise. Because no motion to sever has been made or granted, and because defendants Long V.  
20 Troung and Phuong A. Nguyen have not filed objections to the motion to continue, any  
21 objections that might be implied by these defendants' refusal to stipulate to the continuance, or  
22 by Mr. Nguyen's refusal to sign a speedy trial waiver, are overruled. To the extent that defendant  
23 Steven Connell objects to a trial date after October 31, 2015, his objections are overruled for the  
same reasons.

1        THIS COURT FURTHER FINDS that all of the additional time requested between the  
2 current trial date of and the new trial date of November 2, 2015, is necessary to provide counsel  
3 for the defendants the reasonable time necessary to prepare for trial.

4        NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the trial date will be continued as  
5 to all defendants until November 2, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.

6        IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that pretrial motions will be filed no later than September  
7 25, 2015.

8        IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that stipulating defendants shall file speedy trial waivers no  
9 later than 12:00 p.m. on June 19, 2015, to the extent they have not already done so.

10      IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the time between this date and the new trial date is  
11 excluded in computing the time within which a trial must be held pursuant to Title 18, United  
12 States Code, Section 3161, et seq.

13      DATED this 16th day of June 2015.



14  
15      John C. Coughenour  
16      UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26